

## REMARKS

Claims 13-23 are pending. Of these, claims 13-19 have been amended for clarity.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

### I. The Rejection under 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, claims 14, 16-19, and 23 were found to include unclear phrases. Claims 14 and 16-19, as well as other claims, have been amended to clarify the features which the Examiner found to be objectionable. For example, claim 14 has been amended to a plurality of personal computers access at least one radio communication terminal through the multi-access system, thereby removing any reference to a modem. Claim 16 has also been amended to remove any reference to a modem. (See, for example, Figure 2 for support).

Claim 17 has been amended to recite that data packets belonging to a same call are transmitted from the personal computer for wireless transmission through a plurality of radio communication terminals. (See, for example, Figure 2 for support). These features are apparent from the specification. For example, packets belonging to a same call may be transmitted from one of the personal computers through multiples one ones of the radio communication terminals (300, 310). This can be accomplished because the packets have the same destination IP address. (See Paragraphs [26], [31], [37], [38], [43], and [46]-[50] for support with reference to Figure 2 for support).

Claim 18 recites that data packets belonging to a same call are transmitted between the personal computer and a plurality of radio communication terminals based on a same destination IP address and a same data link address, said same data link address corresponding to the

personal computer. (See, for example, Paragraphs [37], [38], [43], and [46]-[50] for support with reference to Figure 2. Here, the same destination IP address may correspond, for example, to a terminal or other communication device to or through which the data packets of the call are to be transmitted).

Claim 19 has been amended to depend from claim 13.

Applicants submit that the foregoing amendments are sufficient to overcome the § 112, second paragraph, rejection. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## **II. The Rejection under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph**

Claims 13, 14, and 16 were rejected on grounds that the specification fails to provide a written description of the modem recited in these claims. Claim 13 has been amended to delete the features of a modem, i.e., as amended claim 13 recites “a multi-access system including or coupled to a communication device, the multi-access system coupled to the personal computer through a Bluetooth connection . . . data packets are sent from the communication device for transmission via an air interface to the Internet.” (See, for example, Figure 2 and corresponding sections of the specification for support).

Here, the “communication device” may correspond to one or more of the radio communication terminals (300, 310) or another communication device not excluding an encoder, modulation/demodulation device, or other processing circuit or software. Withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is respectfully requested in view of these amendments.

### III. The Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 13-21 and 23 were rejected for being obvious in view of an Agrawal-Hartmann combination. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

The Agrawal patent discloses establishing a Bluetooth connection between a master device and a slave device. However, Agrawal does not teach or suggest at least the following features of amended claim 13, namely “a multi-access system including or coupled to a communication device,” that “data packets are transmitted between the personal computer and the communication device through the Bluetooth connection” between the personal computer and multi-access system, and that “the data packets are sent from the communication device for transmission via an air interface to the Internet.”

The Hartmann publication does not teach or suggest these features missing from the Agrawal patent. The Hartmann publication discloses a system which allows messages 420 to be communicated between a computer 430 and the Internet 410. The computer may be connected to a modem 440 for this purpose. (See Paragraphs [32]-[34] with reference to Figure 4).

However, Hartmann does not teach or suggest many of the features of claim 13 missing from the Agrawal publication. For example, Hartmann does not teach or suggest a multi-access system including or coupled to a communication device, that data packets are transmitted between the personal computer and the communication device through the Bluetooth connection between the personal computer and multi-access system, and that the data packets are sent from the communication device for transmission via an air interface to the Internet.

In view of the foregoing differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable. Furtherance of claim 13 and its dependent claims to allowance is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 17 recites that “data packets belonging to a same call are transmitted from the personal computer for wireless transmission through a plurality of radio communication terminals.” And, claim 18 recites that data packets belonging to a same call are transmitted between the personal computer and a plurality of radio communication terminals based on a same destination IP address and a same data link address, said same data link address corresponding to the personal computer.

For example, as shown in Figure 2, data packets belonging to a same call may be transmitted from personal computer 100 through radio communication terminals 300 and 31 through the air to a destination terminal through the internet. This may be accomplished based on a same destination IP address and/or a same data link address. These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 22 on grounds that the Cousins publication does not teach or suggest the features of base claim 13 missing from the Agrawal patent and Hartmann publication.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3777 DYK/SWN/krf  
Date: May 26, 2009

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-555\191582.doc